UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/286,133	04/01/1999	STEWART SABADELL	49658-024	4582

29989 7590 03/10/2003

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
1600 WILLOW STREET
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER
SHARON, AYAL I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2123	

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/286,133	SABADELL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ayal I Sharon	2123	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 November 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. Claims 1-13 of U.S. Application 09/317,765 filed on 04/01/1999 (provisional application priority date 05/14/1998) are presented for examination. Examiner has reopened prosecution in this case in response to Applicants' arguments in their Appeal Brief (paper #17).

Claim Interpretations

2. Examiner interprets the meanings of the following terms that were not clarified or enabled in the specifications.
3. Examiner interprets a "keys" as being "certain property values in the object entry ... for determining where in the hierarchy tree structure to store the geometry of the object." (specification, p.19, lines 22-26)
4. Examiner interprets "filter objects" as being used "to determine where the geometry of an object is to be inserted into the tree structure." (specification, p.16, line 25 to p.17, line 3)
5. Examiner interprets "modified stack" as being "... used to record and maintain some of the modifications that are made to objects through the use of a visual rendering application." (specification, p.23, lines 14-15)
6. Examiner interprets an "object" as being a CAD or visual rendering software representation of a real-world physical object. "For example, the object properties

associated with a visual rendering application typically allow objects to be viewed in a target scene as having a particular texture or material, or to visualize how certain lighting would look when applied to a particular object." (specification, p.4, lines 10-18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

8. The prior art cited is as follows:

9. U.S. Patent 4,864,497. (Henceforth referred to as "**Lowry**").

10. Claims 1-2, 4-10, and 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Lowry.

11. In regards to Claim 1, Lowry expressly teaches the following limitations:

1. A method for translating objects between applications that use different formats, the method comprising:
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55)

generating a source object in a source application;
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55)

translating the source object to a target object in a target application, wherein the target application has a format that is not supported by the source application;
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55)

performing a first modification to the target object, wherein said first modification is not supported by said source application;

(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

performing a second modification to said source object in said source application; and
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

revising said target object in said target application to reflect said second modification to said source object without removing said first modification to said target object.
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

12. As per Claim 2, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 1, as discussed above. In addition, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 2:

2. The method of Claim 1, wherein the step of performing the first modification to the target object includes the step of performing a type of modification that cannot be performed using said source application.
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55)

13. As per Claim 4, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 1, as discussed above. In addition, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 4:

4. The method of Claim 1, wherein:

the source object is associated with a source geometry and one or more source properties; and
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55)

the step of translating the source object to the target object includes the steps of translating the source geometry to a target geometry; and
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55)

translating the one or more source properties to one or more target properties.
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55)

14. As per Claim 5, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 1, as discussed above., In addition, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 5:

5. The method of Claim 1, wherein the step of translating the source object to the target

object includes the step of:

building a mapping based on a translation between the source object and the target object.
(Lowry: especially Fig.2-Fig.5A; col.5, line 35 to col.6, line 45; col.9 line 59 to col.10, line 61)

15. As per Claim 6, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 5, as discussed above. In addition, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 6:

6. The method of Claim 5, wherein the step of building the mapping includes the step of:
constructing a hierarchical tree structure, wherein the hierarchical tree structure is based on one or more properties associated with the source object.
(Lowry: especially col.1, line 15 to col.2, line 56; col.5, line 32 to col.6, line 46; col.9 line 59 to col.10, line 61)

16. As per Claim 7, Lowry and further in view of Bannon teaches the limitations of Claim 6, as discussed above. In addition, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 7:

7. The method of Claim 6, wherein
the source object is associated with a source geometry and one or more source properties; and

translating the source geometry to a target geometry; and
(Lowry: especially col.1, line 15 to col.2, line 56; col.5, line 32 to col.6, line 46; col.9 line 59 to col.10, line 61)

17. As per Claim 8, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 7, as discussed above. In addition, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 8:

8. The method of Claim 7, wherein the step of generating the set of tree objects includes the steps of
translating the one or more source properties to one or more target properties;
(Lowry: especially col.1, line 15 to col.2, line 56; col.5, line 32 to col.6, line 46)

18. In regards to Claim 9, Lowry expressly teaches the limitations of Claim 9:

9. A method for translating objects between applications that use different formats, the method comprising:

generating a first object in a first application;
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55)

translating the first object to a second object in a second application, wherein the second object has a format that is not supported by the first application;
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55)

performing a first modification to the second object in the second application;
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

performing a second modification to said first object in said first application; and
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

performing a third modification to the second object based on data generated in response to said second modification to said first object, wherein said third modification causes said second object to reflect the second modification that was made to the first object without undoing the first modification to the second object.
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

19. As per Claim 10, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 9, as discussed above.

In addition, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 10:

10. The method of Claim 9, wherein the step of performing the first modification to the second object includes the step of performing a type of modification that cannot be performed using said first application.
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55)

20. In regards to Claim 12, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 12:

12. A computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions for translating objects between applications that use different formats, wherein execution of the one or more sequences of instructions by one or more processors causes the one or more processors to perform the steps of:
(Lowry: especially Fig.1)

generating a source object in a source application;
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

translating the source object to a target object in a target application, wherein the target application has a format that is not supported by the source application;
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

performing a first modification to the target object, wherein said first modification is not supported by said source application;
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

performing a second modification to said source object in said source application; and
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

revising said target object in said target application to reflect said second modification to said source object without removing said first modification to said target object.
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

21. In regards to Claim 13, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 13:

13. A system for translating objects between applications that use different formats, the system comprising:
a memory;
(Lowry: especially Fig.1)

one or more processors coupled to the memory; and
(Lowry: especially Fig.1)

a set of computer instructions contained in the memory, the set of computer instruction including computer instructions which when executed by the one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to perform the steps of:
(Lowry: especially Fig.1)

generating a source object in a source application;
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

translating the source object to a target object in a target application, wherein the target application has a format that is not supported by the source application;
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

performing a first modification to the target object, wherein said first modification is not supported by said source application;
(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

performing a second modification to said source object in said source application; and

(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

revising said target object in said target application to reflect said second modification to said source object without removing said first modification to said target object.

(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

22. In regards to Claim 14, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 14:

14. A method for translating objects between applications that use different formats, the method comprising:

(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

generating a hierarchical structure for organizing one or more properties of a source object being translated to a target object,

(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

wherein each level of the hierarchical structure is associated with a property of an object and wherein the source object is associated with a source application and the target object is associated with a target application;

(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

using one or more filter objects to determine a location, within the hierarchical structure, to map the one or more properties of the source object; and

(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

storing the hierarchical structure in a target file, wherein the target file is used by the second application to construct the target object.

(Lowry: especially Fig.5A and 5B, Items 540, 570, 580, 590; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

23. As per Claim 15, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 14, as discussed above.

In addition, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 15:

15. The method of claim 14, wherein each of the one or more filter objects is associated with a respective level of the hierarchical structure and associated with one or more collection objects of a set of collection objects, and wherein the step of using one or more filter objects comprises:
(Lowry: especially Fig.3-Fig.8; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

determining, for a property of the one or more properties of the source object, a property value from a respective filter object that is associated with the property;
(Lowry: especially Fig.3-Fig.8; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

comparing the property value with a respective collection value associated with each of one or more respective collection objects of the set of collection objects that are associated with the respective filter object; and
(Lowry: especially Fig.3-Fig.8; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

determining a level within the hierarchical structure to map the one or more properties of the source object, based on the comparing the property value with a respective collection value.
(Lowry: especially Fig.3-Fig.8; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

24. As per Claim 16, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 14, as discussed above.

In addition, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 16:

16. The method of claim 14, further comprising:
upon a modification of a property of the target object in the target application, generating a modifier stack for storing the modification, wherein the property of the target object is associated with a respective property of the source object;
(Lowry: especially Fig.3-Fig.8; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

linking the modifier stack with a collection object of a set of collection objects, wherein each collection object of the set of collection objects is associated with a respective level of the hierarchical structure; and
(Lowry: especially Fig.3-Fig.8; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55;

col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

applying the modification of the modifier stack to the target file via the linked collection object to construct the target object.
(Lowry: especially Fig.3-Fig.8; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

25. As per Claim 17, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 16, as discussed above.

In addition, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 17:

17. The method of claim 16, wherein each of the one or more filter objects is associated with a respective level of the hierarchical structure, comprising:
upon a modification of a property of the source object in the source application, using a filter object of the one or more filter objects to determine a level within the hierarchical structure to store the modification;
(Lowry: especially Fig.3-Fig.8; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

applying the modification of the property of the source object to the target file that includes the stored hierarchical structure, at the determined level within the hierarchical structure; and
(Lowry: especially Fig.3-Fig.8; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

applying the modification of the modifier stack to the target file to construct the target object.
(Lowry: especially Fig.3-Fig.8; col.1, lines 15-56; col.2, lines 15-55; col.11, lines 40-65; col.31, lines 29-42)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

26. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

27. The prior art cited is as follows:

28. U.S. Patent 4,864,497. (Henceforth referred to as "**Lowry**").

29. Barequet et al. "A Data Front-End for Layered Manufacturing", Proceedings of 13th Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry. 1997. pp.231-239.

30. Claims 3, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowry in view of Barequet.

31. As per Claim 3, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 1, as discussed above. In addition, Lowry teaches the following limitations of Claim 3:

> 3. The method of Claim 1, wherein:
>
> the source application is a Computer Aided Design (CAD) application;
>
> the step of generating the source object in the source application includes the step of generating a CAD object in said CAD application;
>
> the step of performing a second modification to said source object includes the step of performing a modification to the CAD object; and

However, while Lowry teaches the translation and shared use of files by CAD and CAM applications, Lowry does not expressly teach the translation and shared use of files by CAD and "rendering applications", as claimed in the following limitations:

> the target application is a rendering application; and wherein
>
> the step of translating the source object to the target object includes the step of translating the CAD object into a rendering object;
>
> the step of performing the first modification to the target object includes the step of performing a modification to the rendering object;
>
> the step of revising said target object includes the step of revising the rendering object to reflect the second modification that was made to the CAD object without undoing the first modification to the rendering object.

Barequet, on the other hand, teaches the use of a rendering application to view and edit CAD files. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lowry with the

teachings of Barequet in order to enable the shared use and translation of files between CAD and "rendering applications", because the rendering application taught in Barequet is used to prepare files for CAM applications, and would be functionally equivalent to a CAM application in Lowry's invention. Barequet teaches: "The DFE (Data Front-End) system described in this paper is a geometric software package which supports all stages of preparing CAD data files for production." (Barequet, p.232, col.2, para.3).

32. As per Claim 11, Lowry teaches the limitations of Claim 9, as discussed above. In addition, Lowry teaches the following limitations of Claim 11:

> 11. The method of Claim 9, wherein:
> the first application is a Computer Aided Design (CAD) application;
>
> the step of generating the first object in the first application includes the step of generating a CAD object in said CAD application;
>
> the step of performing a second modification to said first object includes the step of performing a modification to the CAD object; and

However, while Lowry teaches the translation and shared use of files by CAD and CAM applications, Lowry does not expressly teach the translation and shared use of files by CAD and "rendering applications", as claimed in the following limitations:

> the second application is a rendering application; and wherein
>
> the step of translating the first object to the second object includes the step of translating the CAD object into a rendering object;
>
> the step of performing the first modification to the second object includes the step of performing a modification to the rendering object;
>
> the step of performing the third modification to the second object includes the step of performing a third modification to the rendering object to reflect the second

> modification that was made to the CAD object without undoing the first modification to the rendering object.

Barequet, on the other hand, teaches the use of a rendering application to view and edit CAD files. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lowry with the teachings of Barequet in order to enable the shared use and translation of files between CAD and "rendering applications", because the rendering application taught in Barequet is used to prepare files for CAM applications, and would be functionally equivalent to a CAM application in Lowry's invention. Barequet teaches: "The DFE (Data Front-End) system described in this paper is a geometric software package which supports all stages of preparing CAD data files for production." (Barequet, p.232, col.2, para.3).

Response to Arguments

Response to Arguments- 112 (1st Paragraph) Rejections

33. Applicants arguments have been found to be persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejections of Claims 1-13 have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments – 102 Rejections

34. The Applicants make several distinct arguments (paper #17, pp. 11-15) in response to the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections of Claims 14-17 based on Newcombe, Among them, Applicants argue (paper #17, p.12, lines 12-19) that Newcombe does not address

(1) post-translation modifications made in the second application are not lost in subsequent translations, and

(2) post-translation modifications made in the first application do not override modifications of the same object property made in the second application and do not create duplicate objects

Applicants arguments have been found to be persuasive. Examiner has withdrawn the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections based on Newcombe for claims 14-17.

35. Examiner has added new 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections of Claims 1-17 based on Lowry et al.

Response to Arguments – 103 Rejections

36. The Applicants make several distinct arguments (paper #17, pp.15-19) in response to the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of Claims 1-4, 9-11, 12, and 13 based on Barequet and Wohlers:

    1) Wohlers does not teach "revising a target object"

    2) Barequet and Wohlers do not teach "translating a source object"

Applicants arguments have been found to be persuasive. Examiner has withdrawn these rejections.

37. The Applicants make several distinct arguments (paper #17, pp.17-19) in response to the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of Claims 5-8 based on Barequet and Wohlers and Krause:

    1) The art does not teach the limitations of Claim 1

    2) The art does not teach the limitations of Claim 7

Applicants arguments have been found to be persuasive. Examiner has withdrawn these rejections.

Conclusion

38. The following prior art, made of record and not relied upon, is considered pertinent to Applicants' disclosure.

39. Liu, Lung-Chun et al. "Design Data Management in a CAD Framework Environment" 27th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference Proceedings. 1991. pp.156-161.

40. Liu, Lung-Chun et al. "Object Database Support for a Software Project Management Environment". Proceedings of 3rd ACM SIGSOFT/SIGPLAN Software Engineering Symposium on Practical Software Development Environments. 1988. pp.85-961.

41. Shih, Chia-Hui et al. "A Design-Constraint Model to Capture Design Intent". Proceedings of the 4th ACM Symposium on Solid Modeling and Applications. 1997. pp.255-264.

42. Tucker, Allen B. Jr. ed. The Computer Science and Engineering Handbook. 1997. pp. 998-1009, 1066-1074, 1774, 2430-2432.

43. U.S. Patent 5,715,454.

44. U.S. Patent 5,437,027.

45. U.S. Patent 5,794,030.

46. U.S. Patent 5,586,330.

47. U.S. Patent 5,812,964.

48. U.S. Patent 5,649,200.

49. U.S. Patent 5,815,415.

50. U.S. Patent 6,505,204.

51. U.S. Patent 5,995,980.

52. U.S. Patent 5,708,828.

53. U.S. Patent 5,911,074.

54. U.S. Patent 5,970,490.

55. U.S. Patent 6,058,397.

56. U.S. Patent 5,708.798.

57. xxxxxxxxxxxxxx End of Conclusion xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ayal I. Sharon whose telephone number is (703) 306-0297. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, and the first Friday of a biweek, 8:30 am – 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Teska can be reached on (703) 305-9704. Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

Director of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the following office:

4th floor receptionist's office

Crystal Park 2

2121 Crystal Drive

Arlington, VA

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are:

Official communications: (703) 746-7239

Non-Official / Draft communications (703) 746-7240

After Final communications (703) 746-7238

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist, whose telephone number is: (703) 305-3900.

Ayal I. Sharon

Art Unit 2123

February 10, 2003